Niveau(x) d'enseignement : 3 Numéro EDUQ : 9070244
Centre d'intérêt : 755

Adiv, Ellen

A comparison of early immersion and classes d'accueil programs at the grade I level / Ellen Adiv. -- [Montréal] : Commission des écoles protestantes du Grand Montréal, Instructional Services Department, 1980
vi, 27 p. ; 28 cm.

Titre de la couv. Résumé en français et en anglais : p. ii-iv.
Bibliogr. : p. 16-19.

Vedette(s)-secondaire(s) : Commission des écoles protestantes du Grand Montréal. Instructional Services Department

Descripteur(s) : Français (Langue) * Langue seconde * Classe d'immersion * Classe d'accueil * Habileté de communication * Primaire (Ordre d'enseignement)

Le but de cette étude était d'évaluer l'habileté de communication en français d'élèves de 1re année de la CEPGM fréquentant deux programmes intensifs de français langue seconde (immersion primaire et post-accueil) et de comparer leur rendement à celui de francophones du même âge. Les résultats indiquent qu'il n'y avait pas de différence entre les élèves d'immersion et les élèves de post-accueil dans la plupart des sous-tests de compréhension auditive et les sous-tests de production orale qui se rapportaient à la performance quantitative des élèves. Cependant, dans la plupart des autres sous-tests, les élèves d'immersion ont obtenu des résultats inférieurs à ceux des élèves de post-accueil et les deux groupes ont obtenu des résultats inférieurs à ceux des élèves francophones.

Type de document : F
Notice(s) connexe(s) : 8170783

9070244

A COMPARISON OF EARLY IMMERSION AND CLASSES D'ACCUEIL PROGRAMS AT THE GRADE I LEVEL

Ellen Adiv

Instructional Services Department

The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal

December 1980

Acknowledgements

This research was made possible by a research grant to the Instructional Services Department, The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, from le ministère de l'Education, gouvernement du Québec.

I would like to express my thanks to the principals, teachers, and students who participated in this research. I am also indebted to the Bilingual Education Project of the Modern Language Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, for permission to adapt its listening comprehension test (Level 1) to our needs.

```
DDM : 870703
LSN : 70s
NF  : 02433
AU1 : Adiv, Ellen
TIA : A c
TIT : comparison of early immersion and classes d'accueil programs at the
      kindergarten level
TIZ :  / Ellen Adiv
AD  : [Montréal] : Commission des écoles protestantes du Grand Montréal,
      Instructional Services Department, 1979
CL  : 29 p. : ill. ; 28 cm
NT  : Résumé en français au début du v
NT  : Bibliographie: p. 19
NT  : Notes bibliographiques: p. 18
SBZ : (br.)
SAN : Commission des écoles protestantes du Grand Montreal (Québec)
DEW : 372,654    CDE : A235c
LCA : LB    LCB : 1528
NCN : 2    NCS : 755
SU  : Français (Langue)
SU  : Langue seconde
SU  : Classe d'immersion
SU  : Classe d'accueil
SU  : Evaluation de l'apprentissage
SU  : Evaluation de programmes
SU  : Maternelle (Ordre d'enseignement)
ANA : Le but du document est d'évaluer l'habileté linguistique en français
      d'élèves participant à deux programmes différents au niveau de la
      maternelle: un programme d'immersion et un programme de classes
      d'accueil.
ANB : Quatre groupes (53 élèves) provenant de la région montréalaise ont
      été inclus dans cette évaluation: un groupe d'immersion (19), un
      groupe en classe d'accueil située en milieu anglais (15), un autre
      en classe d'accueil dans un milieu français (7), enfin un groupe
      d'élèves francophones (12). L'habileté linguistique en français a
      été évaluée en administrant les tests suivants: un test de
      compréhension auditive, un test d'imitation de phrases et un test de
      production orale.
ANC : L'étude démontre qu'il n'y a pas de différence significative entre
      les résultats des élèves de la classe d'immersion primaire et ceux
      des élèves des classes d'accueil au test de compréhension auditive.
      Les résultats du test d'imitation des phrases et du test de
      production orale des deux classes d'accueil sont toutefois
      supérieurs à ceux des élèves en classe d'immersion. Les élèves de la
      classe d'accueil située dans un milieu francophone ont par ailleurs
      produit plus d'unités syntactiques que ceux de la classe d'accueil
      en milieu anglophone. Autrement, il n'y a pas de différence
      significative entre les deux groupes.
GG  : 063
DSM : I
DPT : u    DPU : 1979
LA  : a    PA  : q    SF  : m    PT  : r    BB  : ar
FNB : BEPGM
FNS : MEQ - DGDP
FNP : DEL
DF  : 820129
```

Résumé

Le but de cette étude était d'évaluer l'habileté linguistique en français d'élèves de 1 ère année fréquentant deux programmes intensifs de français langue seconde (immersion primaire et post-accueil) et de comparer leur performance à celle de locuteurs natifs français du même niveau scolaire. De plus, l'étude a examiné le progrès accompli de la maternelle à la 1ère année dans chacun des deux programmes.

L'habileté linguistique en français a été évaluée en administrant les tests suivants: (1) un test de compréhension auditive, (2) un test de rendement en français, (3) un test d'imitation des phrases, (4) un test de production orale "dirigé" et (5) un test de production orale "libre". Les résultats indiquent qu'il n'y avait pas de différence entre les élèves d'immersion et les élèves de post-accueil dans la plupart des sous-tests de compréhension auditive et les sous-tests de production orale qui se rapportaient à la performance quantitative des élèves. Cependant, dans la plupart des autres sous-tests de performance, les élèves d'immersion ont obtenu des résultats inférieurs à ceux des élèves de post-accueil et les deux groupes ont obtenu des résultats inférieurs à ceux des élèves francophones. On pourrait conclure que les différences dans la performance entre les deux groupes non-francophones correspondent à la distinction entre la compétence communicative et la compétence linguistique.

La comparaison des résultats des tests de cette année à ceux de l'année précédente, lorsque ces élèves étaient à la maternelle, démontre que, durant une période d'un an, le progrès des élèves d'immersion était

plus important que celui des élèves de post-accueil. Ces résultats pourraient être attribués à une différence dans l'intensité de l'enseignement en français entre les deux programmes au niveau de la maternelle.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the linguistic proficiency in French of grade 1 students from two different intensive French second language programs (early immersion and post-accueil) and to compare the performance of these students to that of native French speakers at the same grade level. Furthermore, the study looked at the progress achieved from kindergarten to grade 1 in each of these programs.

French linguistic proficiency was measured by the following test battery: (1) a French listening comprehension test, (2) a test de rendement en français, (3) an elicited imitation test, (4) a directed oral production test and (5) a free oral production test. The results indicate that there were no differences between the early immersion and post-accueil students on most parts of the listening comprehension test and on those measures of the production tests which pertain to the students' quantitative performance. However, on most qualitative measures of performance the early immersion students scored significantly lower than the post-accueil students, who in turn scored significantly lower than the francophone students. It is proposed that these differences in performance between the two non-native French groups may correspond to a distinction between communicative competence and linguistic competence.

The comparison of this year's test results with those of the previous year, when these students were in kindergarten, shows that the early immersion students' progress was more substantial than that of the post-accueil students over the one-year period. These findings seem

attributable to the difference in intensity of exposure to French in the two programs at the kindergarten level.

Table of Content Page

Introduction..... 1

The Programs..... 2

The Method..... 3

The subjects..... 3

The test battery..... 4

Testing procedures..... 8

Results..... 9

Summary and Discussion..... 12

Reference Notes..... 17

References..... 18

Tables..... 20

Appendix:

Explanation of stanine scores..... 27

There are presently two intensive French-as-a-second language programs operated by The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal. The first is an early immersion program and the second is a classes d'accueil program. Although the immediate objective of both programs is to develop proficiency in the second language, the programs differ in terms of their broader long-range goals. The purpose of the early immersion program is to promote bilingualism. Hence the curriculum makes provision for the development of both English and French language skills. On the other hand, the purpose of the classes d'accueil program is to prepare students to function in a regular French school program. Hence, the classes d'accueil program is devoted entirely to the development of French language skills. However, because the initial approach to second language learning is similar in the two programs at the lower elementary grades (for a short description of the two programs see below) it is of interest to compare the achievement in French in these two programs.

The first comparative evaluation of an early immersion program and a classes d'accueil program was carried out during the 1978-79 school year at the kindergarten level (Adiv, Note 1). Three groups of students were compared in that study: an early immersion group, a classes d'accueil group in an English milieu and a classes d'accueil group in a French milieu. A group of francophone students was included for comparison purposes. The results showed that: (1) there were no significant differences in French proficiency between the two classes d'accueil groups; (2) there were no significant differences between the early immersion group and the two classes d'accueil groups on the listening comprehension test; (3) the early immersion students scored significantly lower than the two classes d'accueil groups on practically every

measure of oral production.

The present study was undertaken the following year (1979-80) in order to assess the linguistic proficiency in French of these same students after two years of intensive instruction in French.

The Programs

The Early Immersion Program

In this program instruction is entirely in French from kindergarten through grade 2 except for a weekly period of physical education and library in grades 1 and 2. As in the regular classes of the P.S.B.G.M. the students in the early immersion program attend classes for half a day at the kindergarten level and for a full day from grade 1 onward. At the kindergarten level the teacher, a native French speaker, addresses the students only in French and the children are encouraged to respond in French. This pattern continues in grades 1 and 2, though here the students are required to speak only French in class, even among themselves. English is introduced in grade 3 and from grade 4 onward 60% of the curriculum is taught in English. The instructional materials used in French are those used in the francophone schools, although in many instances specially prepared materials are added to help students develop the necessary linguistic skills in French. The early immersion classes are mostly located within English elementary schools. Hence, outside the classroom the school environment is predominantly English.

The classes d'accueil

These classes were inaugurated at the P.S.B.G.M. in September 1976 and are designed for students who either wish or are required under Bill 101 to attend regular French school programs. The program is a 10-month program

of intensive second language instruction. After this period the student is integrated into the regular French program at the grade level appropriate to his/her age and supportive instruction in the second language is provided on a part-time basis during the following year (post-accueil). Moreover, once students follow the regular French program, they also receive English-as-a-second language instruction. It should be noted that, at the kindergarten level, the classes d'accueil program is a full-day program unless students had attended a full-day pre-kindergarten previously. Consequently, most classes d'accueil students in kindergarten have 50% more classroom instruction in French than immersion students. Some classes d'accueil are situated in regular English schools. For students in these classes, there is little or no exposure to French outside the classroom, at least within the school milieu. This environment is similar to that encountered by immersion students. Other classes d'accueil are situated within French schools and, in some cases, they are partially integrated into the regular French program. The students in these classes benefit, therefore, not only from additional informal exposure to French, but also from direct contacts with native French speaking peers.

The Method

The Subjects

Three groups of grade 1 students participated in this study: (1) a group of students from an early immersion program (hereafter Immersion group); (2) a group of students who had attended a classes d'accueil program in kindergarten and were now attending post-accueil classes (hereafter Post-Accueil group) and (3) a group of francophone students (hereafter French control group). All the students had been tested previously in kindergarten

(Adiv, Note I). In the previous study, the Accueil students had been divided into two groups: students attending a classes d'accueil program in an English milieu and students attending a classes d'accueil program in a French milieu. However, a sizeable percentage of the students in the latter group had left the schools which they had attended in kindergarten. Hence, it was decided to collapse the two classes d'accueil groups into one. All the students in this group had attended a full-day kindergarten program. It should be noted that several students from the other two groups had also moved, so that the number of students tested in this year's study was smaller than in the previous study (for actual sample sizes see Table 1).

The Test Battery

The following French tests were administered: (1) a listening comprehension test, (2) a test de rendement en Français, (3) an elicited imitation test, (4) a directed oral production test and (5) a free oral production test.

1) The Listening Comprehension Test

This test was adapted from the French comprehension test developed by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (Barik, 1977). The test consists of three parts. In parts I and II the students had to select the picture that corresponded to a word or sentence presented orally. In part III, short stories were read orally. Each story was followed by a number of questions also presented orally. For each question the student had to select the picture that represented the correct answer. In each case, the correct picture had to be chosen from four alternatives. In all, the test comprises 35 items. Each part was scored separately and the scores of the three parts were then added together for each student. Both the total scores and the scores of each subtest were considered in the analysis of the results.

2) The Test de Rendement en Français

This test was developed and standardized by the Catholic School Commission of Montreal for use in its French schools. The test assesses a variety of French language arts skills such as reading comprehension, spelling and vocabulary. The test comprises 35 multiple-choice items.

3) The Elicited Imitation Test

This test was first used by Naiman (1974) to measure second language proficiency. It consists of a number of sentences sufficiently long so as to exceed the learner's short-term memory. Each sentence is presented orally either on tape or directly by the tester and the student is asked after each sentence to repeat what he has heard.

In the present study, 10 sentences were constructed preserving the sentence length from the first part of the elicited imitation test developed by Naiman and his associates for use in French immersion schools (see Adreani et al., Note 2). For scoring purposes each sentence was divided into syntactic units. The test contains a total of 56 syntactic units. Each syntactic unit was scored either as correct or incorrect. Each student's score consisted of the total number of correct syntactic units he or she had produced.

4) The Directed Oral Production Test

This test is a French version of the Bilingual Syntax Measure (Burt, Dulay and Hernandez, 1974). The test is designed to measure oral proficiency and particularly structural proficiency in the second language.

The French version is an experimental one and has been used by Bautier-Castaing (1977) to study the acquisition of French grammar by young children of different linguistic backgrounds residing in France. The test consists of 34 grammatical structures which are elicited through short simple questions used in conjunction with four sets of cartoon-type pictures. In the present study the students' responses were scored as either correct or incorrect. Incorrect responses were classified as either (1) grammatically incorrect, (2) semantically incorrect or (3) no response. This last category included responses given in a language other than French.

5) The Free Oral Production Test

This test was developed by the research department of the P.S.B.G.M. It consists of two sets of pictures. The pictures are constructed so as to elicit syntactic units containing subject-verb and subject-verb-object relationships. Each set of pictures depicts a story. The students are asked to narrate what they see in the pictures. In the case of the first set, the students are asked a question about each picture. The other two sets are introduced by starting the story and asking the students to continue. If a student did not complete the story he was urged on by questions such as "et qu'est-ce qui se passe ici?" (and what is happening here?).

To assess the students' proficiency in oral production two different measures of evaluation were used. First, each student's speech sample was evaluated by two raters, working independently, on four different dimensions: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and communication. The ratings ranged from a maximum of 5, indicating native-like skill, to a minimum of 1, indicating very poor skill. The evaluations of both raters were combined to form an average score for each dimension. Second, the

students' speech samples were analyzed linguistically according to four measures, adapted from Andreani et al. (Note 2): a) the number of syntactic units, b) the mean length of an utterance, c) the mean value of a syntactic unit and d) the average complexity of a syntactic unit.

a) The number of syntactic units referred to the number of utterances produced in French. An utterance was defined as a simple sentence. In case a sentence was grammatically incomplete but acceptable within the context, it was counted as a syntactic unit. For each student, the total number of syntactic units was counted. Utterances which were entirely in English were eliminated.

b) The mean length of a syntactic unit referred to the average number of words used per syntactic unit. The total number of words produced by each student was counted and divided by the number of syntactic units produced by that student.

c) The mean value of a syntactic unit. The purpose of this measure was to evaluate the children's ability to speak French beyond the minimal responses elicited by the tester's questions. A score of (2) was given for a complete syntactic unit, i.e., if the syntactic unit was a complete sentence. A score of (1) was given if the syntactic unit was either semantically or syntactically incomplete even though it was contextually acceptable. A score of (0) was given when there was no response to the stimulus or when the utterance was partially in English. Each student's total score was then divided by the number of syntactic units produced by that student.

d) The average complexity of a syntactic unit. The number of syntactic relations attached to the verb, such as subject-verb, object-verb, prepositional phrase, etc., was counted. The verb could be either present

in the utterance or understood from the context. The total number of syntactic relations produced by a student was then divided by the total number of syntactic units produced by that student.

In addition to these measures, the number of subject pronouns used by each student in picture set I was recorded and categorized as either correct or incorrect. The students' production of pronouns was felt to be of special interest because previous studies (Adiv. Notes 3 and 4) had shown that students in immersion programs tend to avoid pronominalization.

Testing procedures

All the tests were administered in May and June 1980. The listening comprehension test and the test de rendement en français were group administered. Each testing session lasted 40 minutes and all test instructions were given in French. The elicited imitation test, the directed oral production test and the free oral production test were administered individually and tape recorded. The responses to the elicited imitation test and the directed oral production test were scored directly from the tapes. The free oral production tests were transcribed for further analysis.

Results

The French language test scores were analyzed using an analysis of variance procedure. Except in the case of two subtests of the oral production tests, the raw scores of the test results were used in the statistical analysis. All the test results are summarized in Table 2 and will be discussed below.

1) The Listening Comprehension Test

The results of the listening comprehension test show that there were no significant differences among the three groups on the total score (Immersion, $\overline{X}$ = 23.00; Post-accueil, $\overline{X}$ = 25.62; French controls, $\overline{X}$ = 27.63) and on subtests II and III of this test. However, the immersion group ($\overline{X}$ = 6.90) scored significantly lower than the Post-Accueil group ($\overline{X}$ = 10.46) and the French controls ($\overline{X}$ = 10.75) on subtest I. This part of the test assessed the students' sensitivity to meaning conveyed through contrasting grammatical structures.

2) The Test de Rendement en Français

As noted above, this test is designed for native French speakers. Here no significant differences were noted between the Immersion group ($\overline{X}$ = 11.70) and the Post-Accueil group ($\overline{X}$ = 13.23). However, both groups scored significantly lower than the French control group ($\overline{X}$ = 18.38). When these results are converted to stanine scores (see Appendix for a brief explanation) and compared to test norms for the French population of the C.E.C.M., both the Immersion and the Post-Accueil groups rank

one step "below average" while the French control group ranks in the "average" category.

3) The Elicited Imitation Test

All three groups differed significantly from one another on this test. The Immersion group ($\bar{X}$ = 35.80) received the lowest scores followed by the Post-Accueil group ($\bar{X}$ = 42.46) and the French control group, who received the highest scores ($\bar{X}$ = 50.00).

4) Directed Oral Production Test

The results for this test show that the French control group ($\bar{X}$ = 19.00) produced significantly more correct responses than the Immersion group ($\bar{X}$ = 6.20) and the Post-Accueil group ($\bar{X}$ = 10.62). There were no significant differences between the latter two groups. Moreover, the Immersion students produced significantly more "no responses" than the French controls. There were no other significant differences among the three groups on this test. It should, however, be noted that the French controls produced numerically far fewer grammatically and semantically incorrect responses than the other two groups. Furthermore, there were marked qualitative differences between the errors made by the francophone students and those made by the Immersion and Post-Accueil students. Closer examination of the data revealed that errors in gender and in number were the most frequent types of errors made by non-native speakers, e.g.,

*Il a un robe jaune.[1]
(Elle a une robe jaune.) "She has a yellow dress".

*Les oiseaux a le bec ouvert.
(Les oiseaux ont le bec ouvert.) "The birds have open beaks".

[1]The asterisk(*) indicates that the sentence is grammatically incorrect.

The francophone students also made some errors in gender, however, all of these errors occurred in adjectives when the latter were used in an attributive construction, e.g.,

*Leurs bouches sont /uver/[1]
(Leurs bouches sont ouvertes) "Their mouths are open"

In most cases the francophone students' deviant speech patterns pertained to more complex syntactic structures, e.g.,

Tester: Qu'est-ce qui est arrivé au poulet? "What happened to the chicken?"
Student: *Il est tout mangé
(Il a été mangé) "It was eaten."

In fact most of the francophone children did not use the passive voice and produced instead:

Le chien a mangé le poulet. "The dog ate the chicken".

Practically all the francophone children had problems with sentences which expressed a condition, e.g.,

Tester: *Qu'est-ce qui serait arrivé si le chien ne l'avait pas mangé (le poulet)? "What would have happened if the dog had not eaten it? (the chicken)?"

*Le roi l'avait mangé. "The king ate it."
(Le roi l'aurait mangé.) "The king would have eaten it."

Only one type of error was frequently produced by native and non-native speakers alike, namely the failure to contract the forms à + le and de + le, e.g.,

*... à le gros monsieur
(... au gros monsieur) "... to the fat man."

*la couronne de le roi.
(la couronne du roi.) " the king's crown."

[1] The part between the slashes indicates a phonetically transcribed word. In such a transcription "u" represents the sound of ou as in ouvert and the sign "e" represents the sound of è.

The relatively high frequency of this type of error in the speech of 6-year-old native French speakers has been noted previously (Adiv, Note 3).

5) The Free Oral Production Test

On three dimensions of this test (pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary), the Immersion students were rated significantly lower than the Post-Accueil students, who in turn were rated significantly lower than the French controls. However, on communicative ability there was no significant difference among the groups (for details of the rating scores see Table 2). The linguistic analyses revealed that there were no significant differences among the three groups in the number of syntactic units produced and in the mean length of these units. However, the mean value of the syntactic units (maximum = 2) produced by the French control group ($\bar{X}$ = 1.98) was significantly higher than those produced by the Immersion group ($\bar{X}$ = 1.79) and the Post-Accueil group ($\bar{X}$ = 1.83). Moreover, the complexity of the syntactic units produced by the French control group ($\bar{X}$ = 2.18) was much higher than those produced by the Immersion group ($\bar{X}$ = 1.89) and the Post-Accueil group ($\bar{X}$ = 1.99). There were no significant differences between the latter two groups on these two measures.

Summary and Discussion

The results from this study can be summarized as follows:

1) The Immersion group scored lower than the French control group on subtest I of the listening comprehension test, on the test de rendement en français, on the elicited imitation test and on most measures pertaining to the qualitative performance of the oral production tests.

2) There were no significant differences between the Immersion group and the Post-Accueil group on the listening comprehension test, except for subtest I, on which the Immersion group scored significantly lower than the Post-Accueil group. The Immersion group also scored significantly lower than the Post-Accueil group on the elicited imitation test and on three dimensions of the global evaluation of the free oral production test (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary). There were no other significant differences between these two groups on the production tests.

3) There were no significant differences between the Post-Accueil group and the French control group on the listening comprehension test. However, the Post-Accueil group scored significantly lower than the French control group on the same measures of the various production tests on which there had been significant differences between the latter group and the Immersion group.

The most noteworthy pattern to emerge from this study is that the Immersion students performed as well as the Post-Accueil students in three areas of linguistic knowledge: (1) comprehension, (2) directed production and (3) quantitative aspects of free production. It can be argued that, with the exception of directed production, these areas are areas of general linguistic knowledge, i.e., areas which pertain only to the learner's ability either to comprehend or transmit semantic intention without reference to his linguistic competence in specific areas such as pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. It is in the latter areas that the Immersion students scored significantly lower than the Post-Accueil students.

It is possible that this difference between general second language proficiency and proficiency in specific areas of linguistic knowledge corresponds to the distinction made by some researchers (Savignon, 1972; Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker, 1976) between communicative competence and linguistic accuracy. Tarone, Cohen & Dumas (1976) have defined several "communication strategies," such as topic avoidance, circumlocution and appeal to authority (the latter refers to asking someone to supply the missing form or lexical item). In each of these cases the learner may succeed in communicating without necessarily demonstrating strictly linguistic competence.

Over the past decade the development of linguistic competence has been viewed as a succession of stages which reflect the learner's increasing ability to approximate the target language -- in this case French -- system (see for example Nemser, 1972; Dulay and Burt, 1976; Larsen-Freeman, 1978; Porquier and Frauenfelder, 1980). This model of second language development parallels basic processes of first language acquisition (Brown 1972, Slobin 1973). Corder (1978) has proposed that it may be more realistic to view first and second language development as a continuum of increasing complexity rather than a sequence of frequently overlapping stages. Viewed in this perspective, it may well be that the process of complexification of the learner's second language system proceeds along the same continuum as that of first language development. This hypothesis raises some interesting questions as to the extent to which factors such as intensity of program and cumulative time could influence greater rapprochement between first and second language learners as they proceed along the continuum. In order to

examine the linguistic development of the three groups over a longer period of time, it was decided to compare the results of the tests administered in kindergarten with those obtained in the present study using an analysis of variance with repeated measures. In this part of the study the term "Accueil" will be used to refer to both accueil and post-accueil classes. For obvious reasons, only the kindergarten results of the children who were also tested in grade 1 are included in the analysis. Moreover, since there were no significant differences between the Immersion and Accueil students on the listening comprehension test at either grade level, only the results of the production tests were analyzed.

The results of this comparison (for a detailed summary see Table 3) indicate that on all measures of the production test both main effects (program and grade level) were statistically significant. Thus, there were not only marked differences between the programs at each grade level, but also significant progress from kindergarten to grade 1. There was, however, a significant program X grade interaction effect on practically all test measures, indicating that progress in French proficiency from kindergarten to grade 1 differed in the three programs. Further analysis revealed that the improvement in performance from kindergarten to grade 1 was much more pronounced for the Immersion students than for the Accueil students. Of particular interest is the finding that the number of syntactic units produced by the Immersion students had more than doubled from kindergarten to grade 1. Furthermore, the Immersion students produced significantly more complex syntactic units in grade 1 than in kindergarten, whereas no such change was noted in the performance of the Accueil students.

This comparatively greater improvement in French performance by the Immersion students seems attributable to the difference in instruction time in the immersion program -- all of which is in French -- between kindergarten (½ day) and grade 1 (full day). The findings of the kindergarten/grade 1 comparison also suggest that differences between the Immersion and Accueil groups may continue to diminish as long as the intensity of instruction in French remains the same for both groups.

Reference Notes

1. Adiv, E. A comparison of early immersion and classes d'accueil programs at the kindergarten level. Instructional Services Department. The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, December 1979.

2. Andreani, P., Feider, H., Hardy Roch, M., and Lortie, A.M. Etude comparative sur l'apprentissage du français entre les enfants-immigrants en classe d'accueil et les enfants-immigrants en insertion directe. La Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal, 1978.

3. Adiv, E. A comparison of second language performance in two alternative French immersion programs. Instructional Services Department. The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, January 1980.

4. Adiv, E. An analysis of second language performance in an early French immersion program: grades 3, 4 and 5. Instructional Services Department. The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, September, 1980.

References

Barik, H. French Comprehension Test, Level I. OISE, Toronto, 1977

Bautier - Castaing, E. Acquisition comparée de la syntaxe du français par les enfants francophones et non-francophones. Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée, 1977, 27, 19-41.

Brown, R. A first language, the early stages. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Burt, M.K., Dulay, H.C., & Hernandez, E. Bilingual Syntax Measure. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976.

Corder, S.P. Language-learner language. In J.C. Richards (Ed.) Understanding second and foreign language learning. Newbury House publishers, Rowley, Mass. 1978.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. Creative construction in second language learning and teaching. Language Learning, 1976, Special Issue, 4, 65-79.

Larsen-Freeman, Evidence of the need for a second language acquisition index of development. In W.C. Ritchies (Ed.) Second language acquisition research, New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Naiman, N. The use of elicited imitation in second language acquisition research. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1974, 2, 2-37.

Nemser, W. Approximative systems of foreign language learners, IRAL, 1971, 9, 115-123.

Porquier, R., & Frauenfelder, Y. Enseignants et apprenants face à l'erreur. Le Français dans le Monde, 1980, 154, 29-36.

Savignon, S. J. Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching. Didier, 1972

Slobin, D. I. Cognitive prerequisites for the development of grammar. In C. A. Ferguson & D. I. Slobin (Eds.) Studies of child language development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.

Tarone, E., Cohen, A., & Dumas, G. A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: a framework for communication strategies. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1976, 9, 76-90

Tarone, E., Frauenfelder, Y., & Selinker, L. Systematicity/variability and stability/instability in interlanguage systems. Language Learning, 1976, Special Issue, 4, 93-134.

Table 1

Sample sizes

Immersion group	10
Post-Accueil group	11
French control group	8

Table 2

Summary of Grade 1 Test Results[a]

	Immersion	Post-Acc.	French C.	F ratio
(1) Listening Comprehension				
Total (35)[b]	23.00	25.62	27.63	1.25
- sub test I (12)	6.90	10.46	10.75	16.38***
- sub test II (9)	6.40	6.92	7.38	0.54
- sub test III (14)	9.70	7.85	9.50	1.30
(2) Test de rendement en français (35)	11.70	13.23	18.38	5.51**

df: 2,28

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

[a]Mean scores joined by a line differ significantly from one another according to the Newman-Keuls Test of Multiple Comparison Procedure.

[b]Maximum scores in parentheses.

Table 2 (cont'd)

Summary of Grade 1 Test Results

	Immersion	Post-Acc.	French C.	F ratio
(3) Elicited Imitation (56)	35.80	42.46	50.00	8.79**
(4) Directed Oral Production (34)[a]				
Correct responses	6.20	10.62	19.00	8.28**
Incorrect responses				
- grammatically incorrect	19.50	20.00	14.50	2.39
- semantically incorrect	3.00	2.00	0.12	3.29
- no response	3.40	2.00	0.38	3.51*

df: 2,28

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

[a] 34 items distributed according to 4 measures of evaluation.

Table 2 (cont'd)

Summary of Grade 1 Test Results

	Immersion	Post-Acc.	French C.	F Ratio
(S) Free Oral Production				
Global evaluation				
- pronunciation (S)	3.95	4.42	5.00	25.91***
- grammar (S)	3.65	4.00	4.56	23.24***
- vocabulary (S)	3.65	4.23	4.94	25.46***
- communication (S)	4.20	4.23	4.75	2.27
Syntactic units				
- numbers of syntactic units	21.20	25.00	24.25	1.69
- mean length of syntactic units	4.79	5.04	5.04	0.47
- mean value of syntactic units	1.79	1.83	1.98	6.55**
- average complexity of syntactic units	1.89	1.99	2.18	4.79*

df: 2,28

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .00$.

Table 3

Summary of Test Results According to Program and Grade

Elicited Imitation

	Immersion	Accueil	French C.
Kindergarten	46.47	73.08	87.50
Grade 1	63.93	75.82	89.29

F ratios: Program 20.63***
Grade 8.90**
Program and Grade 4.29*

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Table 3 (cont'd)

Summary of Test Results According to Program and Grade

Number of Syntactic Units

	Immersion	Accueil	French C.
Kindergarten	10.60	18.08	21.50
Grade 1	21.20	25.00	24.25

F ratios:		
	Program	7.82***
	Grade	53.17***
	Program and Grade	5.35*

Mean Length of Syntactic Units

	Early Immersion	Accueil	French Control
Kindergarten	2.78	3.81	4.58
Grade 1	4.79	5.04	5.04

F ratios:		
	Program	7.21**
	Grade	56.92***
	Program and Grade	6.78**

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Table 3 (cont'd)

Summary of Test Results According to Program and Grade

Mean Value of Syntactic Units

	Immersion	Accueil	French C.
Kindergarten	1.36	2.02	1.98
Grade 1	1.79	1.83	1.98

F ratios:	Program	5.59**
	Grade	0.54
	Program and Grade	3.20

Average Complexity of Syntactic Units

	Immersion	Accueil	French C.
Kindergarten	1.23	1.85	2.41
Grade 1	1.89	1.99	2.18

F ratios:	Program	16.09***
	Grade	5.30*
	Program and Grade	9.03***

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

EXPLANATION OF STANINE SCORES

S T A N I N E

The stanine scale is a simple nine point scale of standard scores. (The word stanine was derived for STAndard NINE-point scale).

In this scale, raw scores are converted to scores which range from 1 (low) to 9 (high) with a mean of 5 and a standard deviation of 2.